UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,963	09/12/2003	Terry O'Halloran	PA1524.ap.US	6345
MARK A. LITI	7590 01/28/200 MAN	EXAMINER		
	MAN & ASSOCIATES	HOEL, MATTHEW D		
3209 WEST 76th STREET SUITE 205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
EDINA, MN 55	5435	3714		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/28/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/660,963	O'HALLORAN, TERRY		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Matthew D. Hoel	3714		

	Matthew D. Hoel	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better the content of	sideration and/or search (see NO ⁻ v);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	·		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8,10-14,16 and 17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce pecause:
 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Peter DungBa Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714	/M. D. H./ Examiner, Art Unit 3714		

Continuation of 13. Other: See Continuation Sheet. Regarding the applicant's remarks on Page 15, the final rejection did not address Claims 9 and 15, because they were cancelled the last time the claims were amended (claims as entered 12-19-2007). Regarding claims 1, 11, 12, and 17, the outcome of Hagiwara ('907) is only the result of the single, communal result. Quoting from '907 (2:19-30): "A subordinate machine 2a includes a display control circuit 15 for controlling the CRT monitor 7a and actuating the speaker 10a in response to a command from the CPU 11, a detector 18a for sensing betted coins inserted in the slot 8a (FIG. 1), and a coin paying-out mechanism 19a for paying out coins to the coin outlet 9a (FIG. 1). The CRT monitor 7a displays the same contents (symbol rows and others) displayed on the CRT display device of the main machine. The speaker 10a outputs different sounds corresponding to the result, "win" or "lost" of the game. This augments the players' amusement." For example, the array of symbols shown on screen 7a ('907, Fig. 1) is exactly the same as the array of symbols shown on the main display 6 of '907, Fig. 1. Thus, the result or outcome (winning combination or payline), is solely based on the single, communal result. The examiner is not interpreting "outcome" as whether or not a player won, or how much a player won; such is not claimed. What Hagiwara ('907) lacked in the single, communal result, was the intervals between game results of '284. Hagiwara is an attract mode in a similar sense to the attract mode of Acres ('284) in that the single, communal result is visible to all players (main display 6, Fig. 1, 1:66-2:9), and is even called a demonstration game (2:44-50), which is certainly synonymous with an attract mode. The examiner concedes that Hagiwara requires a player to bet on the single, communal result in order to win, but the outcome (winning combination) only depends on the single, communal result. The intervals between game results not anticipated by Hagiwara with the limitation of the intervals being controlled solely by the processor, this is anticipated by Acres, et al. (U.S. patent 5,876,284 A; in Figs. 36-38, 39:61-42:33). This limitation is anticipated by '284 (item 610, Fig. 36 and 40:38-60). In this limitation, the length of the display mode is not determined by how much the player has bet. The time interval between game results of '284 applied to '907 would merely keep the attract mode with repeated spins of the reels going, allowing a player or players to bet on the spins of the reels at any time. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Hagiwara ('907), the main reference teaches a demonstration or attract mode in 2:43-50 in which the reels spins repeatedly until the player makes a bet. The modification of '907 with the above-cited limitation of '284 would result in a game in which the player can bet on the spins of the demonstration or attract mode at any time without any interruption to the spins of the reels ('284 teaches game starting after 30 or 50 seconds, 2:55-61). For the reasons outlined above, the claimed invention is essentially a slot machine format for a lottery as a single, communal result taking place at fixed intervals such as once per week, etc., the outcome of which does not depend on whether an individual player wagers or not, with the player having to place a wager in order to be eligible to win. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant as to the claims' condition for allowance.